



## ***Internal Reviews***

### ***Performance Period October-December 2004***

## **Introduction**

The third year of implementation of Internal Reviews began in October 2004, with nineteen complexes conducting their reviews in the second quarter of fiscal year 2005 (October-December 2004). This report provides data regarding the results of the reviews conducted during the quarter, as well as analysis of how Hawaii is doing as a state in providing services to students with special needs.

## **Findings**

Internal Reviews were conducted in the second quarter in 19 of the 41 complexes. This represents just under half of the complexes that will conduct Internal Reviews this year.

In the quarter, 95% of complexes achieved the desired goal for acceptable system performance. Overall child status was acceptable for 92% of youth reviewed. One complex, Kalaheo, did not meet the performance target. System performance for the Kalaheo Complex acceptable for 81% of the youth reviewed, which was just short of meeting the goal of 85%. Both cases found to have unacceptable system performance were children receiving services through the Early Intervention system. The complex did meet the performance target for child status with all cases reviewed, or 100% found to have acceptable child status. A corrective action plan with targeted strategies for improving areas of concern identified in the review is currently under development by the complex team.

Eighteen complexes met the performance goal for child status. The only complex not meeting acceptable child status was King Kekaulike where 83% of those reviewed were found to be doing acceptably well across measures of child well being.

Below are the Statewide results for all Internal Reviews conducted in the second quarter (October-December 2004):

<b>STATE TOTAL</b> <b>n=296</b>		
<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>90% (n=266)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>5% (n=16)</b>	<b>95%</b> <b>(n=282)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>2% (n=7)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>2% (n=7)</b>	
<b>92%</b> <b>(n=273)</b>		

Table 1. Statewide Internal Review Results (Second Quarter, Fiscal Year 2005)

Child status and system performance results for each complex reviewed in the second quarter (October-December 2004) Internal Reviews are displayed below in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Internal Reviews for Child Status and System Performance (Second Quarter, FY 2005)

Complex	Date	Sample Size	Child Status SY 2004-2005	System Performance SY 2004-2005
Central Kauai	October 11-14, 2004	14	100%	100%
Pahoa	October 11-13, 15, 2004	14	100%	100%
Farrington	October 12-15, 18-22, 2004	21	91%	95%
Lanai	October 18-22, 2004	13	92%	100%
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	October 25-29, 2004	18	89%	89%
Pearl City	October 25-29, 2004	19	89%	100%
Waialua	October 25-29, 2004	14	93%	93%
Kahuku	November 1, 3-5, 2004	14	86%	93%
Aiea	November 8-10, 12, 2004	14	100%	100%
Kohala	November 8-10, 12, 2004	12	100%	100%
Campbell	November 9-10, 12, 15-19, 2004	21	90%	95%
Kalani	November 15-19, 2004	14	86%	100%
Kapa'a	November 15-19, 2004	13	92%	92%
Kalaheo	November 29-30, December 1-3, 2004	16	100%	81%
King Kekaulike	November 29-30, December 1-3, 2004	18	83%	94%
Konawaena	November 29-30, December 1-3, 2004	14	86%	86%
Kaiser	December 6-10, 2004	13	92%	100%
Nanakuli	December 6-10, 2004	14	93%	93%
Radford	December 6-10, 2004	20	95%	100%

## Description of the Samples

There were a total of 296 students reviewed in the quarter. Table 3 shows the distribution of cases reviewed across school levels and Early Intervention.

Table 3. Distribution of the Sample (Second Quarter, FY 2005)

	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Early Intervention	2nd Quarter
Central Kauai	5	3	4	2	<b>14</b>
Pahoa	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Farrington	4	6	9	2	<b>21</b>
Lanai	5	3	4	1	<b>13</b>
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	4	5	7	2	<b>18</b>
Pearl City	6	3	9	1	<b>19</b>
Waialua	3	3	6	2	<b>14</b>
Kahuku	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Aiea	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Kohala	4	4	4	0	<b>12</b>
Campbell	5	4	10	2	<b>21</b>
Kalani	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Kapa'a	5	3	4	1	<b>13</b>
Kalaheo	4	4	6	2	<b>16</b>
King Kekaulike	6	4	6	2	<b>18</b>
Konawaena	5	4	3	2	<b>14</b>
Kaiser	4	3	5	1	<b>13</b>
Nanakuli	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Radford	3	3	12	2	<b>20</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>296</b>

Further description of the sample is presented in Table 4. Sampling guidelines call for samples to be based on 2% of the IDEA population and 1% of the 504-student population. Of the total number of cases reviewed in the second quarter (N=296), 20% were receiving care coordination from the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD). Overall, approximately 49% were IDEA or 504 Felix class students that are receiving case management services by the schools, 20% are IDEA non-Felix students, and 11% were receiving Early Intervention Services. This distribution meets the requirements for sampling distribution set by the State.

Table 4. Description of the Sample (Third Quarter, FY 2004)

	CAMHD Felix	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA Non-Felix	Early Intervention	2nd Quarter
Central Kauai	3	6	3	2	14
Pahoa	3	6	3	2	14
Farrington	4	11	4	2	21
Lanai	3	6	3	1	13
Hilo/Laupahoehoe	4	8	4	2	18
Pearl City	4	10	4	1	19
Waialua	0	9	3	2	14
Kahuku	4	6	2	2	14
Aiea	2	7	3	2	14
Kohala	4	6	2	0	12
Campbell	4	11	4	2	21
Kalani	2	7	3	2	14
Kapa'a	3	6	3	1	13
Kalaheo	3	8	3	2	16
King Kekaulike	4	9	3	2	18
Konawaena	3	6	3	2	14
Kaiser	3	6	3	1	13
Nanakuli	3	6	3	2	14
Radford	4	10	4	2	20
<b>Total</b>	60	144	60	32	296

Table 5 displays the range of IDEA disability categories that were represented in the samples. The 296 youth reviewed represented the 14 IDEA eligibility categories, 504 Felix students, and children who are categorized as Early Intervention IDEA. The largest percentage of youth was in the category of Emotional Disturbance (17%). Specific Learning Disability (15%) and Other Health Impairments (15%) were the next most frequent.

Table 5. Disability Categories (Second Quarter, FY 2005)

	Central Kauai	Pahoa	Farrington	Lanai	Hilo/Laupahoehoe	Pearl City	Waihua	Kahuku	Aiea	Kohala	Campbell	Kalani	Kapa'a	Kalaheo	King Kekaulike	Konawaena	Kaiser	Nanakuli	Radford	Total
Autism	1	1	1		3	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1		2	1	1	21
Deaf/Blindness																	1			1
Deafness						1														1
Developmental Delay	1	1	2		1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1		1	2		1	1	20
Emotional Disturbance	2	2	6	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	2	1	1	3	4	3	1	2	3	51
Hearing Impairment	1	1	1	1		1							1	1			1		1	9
Mental Retardation	2	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		3	1	1	1	1			2	1	19
Multiple Disabilities	1	1	1	1		1	1	1			1					1	1	1	1	12
Orthopedic Impairment			1				1				2				1				1	6
Other Health Impairments	1	2	1	3	5	3	1	2	2	1	3	3	2	4	2	1	1	2	4	43
Specific Learning Disability	1	2	4	1	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	4	2	3	4	1	2	3	44
Speech/Language Impairment	1			1	1	1		1		1				1	1					8
Traumatic Brain Injury											1				1		1			3
Visual Impairment									1			1							1	3
504 Felix	1	1	1	1		2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	23
IDEA, Early Intervention	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2		2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	32
<b>2nd Quarter</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>296</b>

## Participants

A total of 610 school, Family Guidance Center (FGC) and University of Hawaii (UH) personnel, and community members, including parents, participated in the Internal Reviews conducted in the reporting quarter. The participants represented 29 different role groups. The largest group represented was Special Education Teachers (107), followed by Early Intervention Personnel (78), School Counselors (72) and Resource Teachers (65) and Teachers (65). There was some duplication in counts for State-level DOE staff, CAMHD Performance Management staff, and Quality Assurance Specialists, who participate in multiple complex reviews.

Table 6. Internal Review Participants (Second Quarter, FY 2005)

	Central Kauai	Pahoa	Farrington	Lanai	Hilo/ Laupahoehoe	Pearl City	Waialua	Kahuku	Aiea	Kohala	Campbell	Kalani	Kapa'a	Kalaheo	King Kekaulike	Konawaena	Kaiser	Nanakuli	Radford	Total
Counselor (School, Special Education, High Risk, Academic, 504, Department Chair)	0	2	13	3	1	7	5	3	4	2	2	4	0	3	2	2	6	5	8	72
Educational Assistant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4
Principal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
Vice Principal	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	12
Psychological Examiner	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
DOE Contracted Mentors	1	1	3	1	2	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	2	25
Resource Teacher (State, District, Complex, PSAP, Student Support, Literacy, CSSS)	8	3	4	3	8	2	0	1	2	5	1	5	5	8	3	4	1	1	1	65
SBBH Therapist, Manager	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	1	1	1	21
Psychologist (District, Complex, School)	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	9
Special Education Department Chair	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Special Education Teacher (including Pre-School Teacher)	0	6	8	3	2	15	5	8	7	1	15	9	0	4	2	2	6	7	7	107
Speech Language Pathologist	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Student Services Coordinator	0	5	4	0	6	4	0	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	1	5	46
Teacher (General Ed, Title I, Reading, Transition, GT)	0	2	2	1	3	8	5	0	8	0	12	7	0	1	0	0	9	4	3	65
Coordinator (Evaluation, School Health, SID, Curriculum, Literacy, Rise)	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
School Assessment Liaison, SAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Librarian, Reading Specialist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Autism Consultant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Special Education Director, Educational Specialist, School Renewal Specialist, District Educational Specialist, Retired Administrator, DOE Administrator	2	1	5	4	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	25
Social Worker	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	5
Parent/Community Member, UH Faculty Member	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	11
Branch Chief, Clinical Director, Mokihana Director	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
CAMHD Program Manager, Supervisor	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Quality Assurance Specialist, DOH	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	2	15
Family Support Worker, FGC	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Mental Health Care Coordinator, Mentor	0	2	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	17
Mental Health Supervisor	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Public Health Nurse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Early Intervention Personnel	5	3	5	3	4	2	5	6	7	0	4	6	3	5	4	5	3	4	4	78
<b>2nd Quarter Total Participants</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>610</b>

## Review Outcomes and Trends

Table 7. System Performance Results by Agency Involvement (Second Quarter, FY 2005)

Complex		Early Intervention	FGC Care Coordinated	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA
Kalaheo	Acceptable	0	3	7	3
	Unacceptable	2	0	1	0

Examination of child status and system performance indicators demonstrates trends among the complexes as well as findings that are complex-specific. AS discussed previously, of the nineteen complexes reviewed, all but one complex (Kalaheo Complex) performed at an acceptable level for system performance. Kalaheo was 4% below the performance threshold, and two cases with unacceptable system performance were receiving services through Early Intervention. One student reviewed with unacceptable system performance was receiving care coordination services through School-based Behavioral Health.

### **Statewide Trends**

Content analyses of Internal Review Reports reveal positive statewide trends and patterns demonstrating viable local service systems. Concerns identified by review teams were addressed in Complex Action Plans.

In several of the complex reviews in the last school year, and for the Kalaheo complex, children in the early intervention system have been found to have unacceptable system performance. The impact of this on the complexes' ability to achieve their performance target is secondary to the trend of the service system's inability to provide necessary supports and services to this population. Concerted review of these data are necessary. The Early Intervention Section of the Department of Health has been invited, along with other stakeholders and child-serving agencies, to join the Statewide Interagency Quality Assurance Meeting, where Internal Review data and results are routinely discussed.

## State-level Feedback on Internal Review Reports

Each Internal Review generates a report on the results of the reviews, reporting on core performance indicators, and an improvement plan on areas identified as needing strengthening based on review findings and data. The overall goal is to imbed reflective practice at all levels that will facilitate improvements that are based on accurate, current data. To assure an accurate read and proactive improvement strategies, the reports are reviewed and feedback is provided. Each report is due thirty days following the conclusion of the Internal Review unless a specific waiver is granted, and feedback is due back to the complex within another thirty days.

Responses to the reports are in process. Feedback is given in two main areas: the quality of the report and the review process, and the quality of the improvement plan. The plan itself can be accepted, accepted with refinements recommended, or commented on with a request for a revised plan. Overall, Internal Review reports have improved considerably from previous years' submittals.



## Summary

Based on the initial scores from the Internal Reviews conducted in the first quarter, the state continues to demonstrate that the vast majority of youth with special needs continue to do well, and consistently receive services that are well coordinated, well implemented, and are producing positive results. The inclusion of Early Intervention, Developmental Disabilities, families and Child Welfare in the Statewide Interagency Quality Assurance Committee should prove to be an important addition for the purposes of discussing core interagency performance issues.

## Complex Data

The following section provides a “profile” of each complex reviewed over the second quarter of fiscal year 2005 (October-December 2004). Presented are data by complex on Internal Reviews and core indicators for the Family Guidance Centers and schools. Data are current for the quarter the Internal Review occurred. Family Guidance Center data include number and percentage of clients: 1) in out of state treatment settings, 2) in out of home treatment, 3) with service delivery gaps, 4) with complaints, and 5) who have current CSPs. Also included are data on the 6) sample size of CSPs that were audited with a CSP quality instrument, and 7) the percentage of those with overall acceptable quality. 8) Staffing vacancies in the FGC for the complex are also presented. School data for each complex include 1) number of service gaps, 2) percentage of referrals that were processed within timelines, 3) number of written and telephone complaints received by the State Office, 4) number of hearing requests, and 5) percentage of special education teachers that are certified. Also presented are data on 6) suspensions (regular education to special education numbers and ratios).

## Central Kauai October 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=14)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	34	0%
Out of Home	10	34	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	34	0%
Complaints	0	34	0%
CSP Timelines	17	18	94%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	1	90

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	3,595	152	352	54	4.0	15.3

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Pahoa October 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=14)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	28	0%
Out of Home	9	28	32%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	28	0%
Complaints	0	28	0%
CSP Timelines	21	28	75%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
6	6	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	0	93

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	1,459	88	305	55	6.0	18.0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Farrington October 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=21

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=18)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>9% (n=2)</b>	<b>95% (n=20)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**91%  
(n=19)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	18	0%
Out of Home	2	18	11%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	18	0%
Complaints	1	18	6%
CSP Timelines	18	18	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
4	4	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	95%	0	0	0	88

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	7,464	126	744	44	1.7	5.9

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Lanai October 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**92%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	4	0%
Out of Home	1	4	25%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	4	0%
Complaints	2	4	50%
CSP Timelines	4	4	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	1	100

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	506	7	134	11	1.4	8.2

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Hilo/Laupahoehoe October 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=18

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>83% (n=15)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>89% (n=16)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	

**89%  
(n=16)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	2	75	3%
Out of Home	23	75	31%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	75	1%
Complaints	0	75	0%
CSP Timelines	67	75	89%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
6	6	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	1	0	80

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	3,801	26	646	7	.7	1.0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Pearl City October 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=19

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>89% (n=17)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>11% (n=2)</b>	<b>100% (n=19)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**89%  
(n=17)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	19	0%
Out of Home	9	19	47%
Service Delivery Gaps	3	19	16%
Complaints	0	19	0%
CSP Timelines	19	19	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	98%	0	1	1	88

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	6,156	101	746	58	1.6	7.8

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## Waialua October 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>93% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>93% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	

**93%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	8	0%
Out of Home	1	8	13%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	8	0%
Complaints	0	8	0%
CSP Timelines	8	8	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	1	0	80

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	1,262	6	217	1	.5	.5

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kahuku November 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>79% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>93% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**86%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	1	21	5%
Out of Home	2	21	10%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	21	0%
Complaints	0	21	0%
CSP Timelines	7	21	33%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	95%	0	0	2	90

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	3,433	60	389	31	1.7	8.0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Aiea November 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=14)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	8	0%
Out of Home	4	8	50%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	8	0%
Complaints	0	8	0%
CSP Timelines	8	8	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	100%	0	0	0	84

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	45,261	31	392	12	.73	3.1

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kohala November 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	11	0%
Out of Home	0	11	0%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	11	0%
Complaints	0	11	0%
CSP Timelines	11	11	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	0	92

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	771	3	140	2	.4	1.4

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Campbell November 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=21

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>90% (n=19)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>95% (n=20)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	

**90%  
(n=19)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	18	0%
Out of Home	11	18	61%
Service Delivery Gaps	3	18	17%
Complaints	0	18	0%
CSP Timelines	18	18	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
2	98%	0	1	2	83

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	7,084	103	776	47	1.5	6.1

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kalani November 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>100% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**86%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	11	0%
Out of Home	4	11	36%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	11	0%
Complaints	0	11	0%
CSP Timelines	11	11	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	2	2	86

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	3,465	49	367	13	1.4	3.5

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kapa'a November 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>92% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	

**92%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	41	0%
Out of Home	19	41	46%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	41	0%
Complaints	0	41	0%
CSP Timelines	25	27	93%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
4.5	3.5	78%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	0	100

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,920	135	402	58	4.6	14.4

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kalaheo November-December 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=16

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>81% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>81% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>19% (n=3)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=16)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	31	0%
Out of Home	8	31	26%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	31	0%
Complaints	0	31	0%
CSP Timelines	8	31	26%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
6	6	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	86%	0	0	11	81

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	3,922	68	535	30	1.7	5.6

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## King Kekaulike November 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=18

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>83% (n=15)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>11% (n=2)</b>	<b>94% (n=17)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	

**83%  
(n=15)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	44	0%
Out of Home	33	44	75%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	44	0%
Complaints	2	44	5%
CSP Timelines	42	44	95%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
2	67%	0	1	7	87

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	3,764	50	617	27	1.3	4.3

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Konawaena November-December 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>86% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	

**86%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	35	0%
Out of Home	10	35	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	35	0%
Complaints	0	35	0%
CSP Timelines	28	35	80%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1.6	1.6	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	0	93

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,112	126	295	49	6.1	16.6

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kaiser December 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>92% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>8% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

92%  
(n=12)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	11	0%
Out of Home	3	11	27%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	11	0%
Complaints	0	11	0%
CSP Timelines	10	11	91%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	73%	0	0	2	79

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,997	30	275	6	1.0	2.2

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Nanakuli December 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>93% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**93%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	1	28	4%
Out of Home	6	28	21%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	28	0%
Complaints	1	28	4%
CSP Timelines	28	28	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	1	0	96

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,461	152	411	82	6.0	20.0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Radford December 2004

### Internal Review Results

n=20

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>95% (n=19)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=20)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**95%  
(n=19)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	11	0%
Out of Home	5	11	45%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	11	0%
Complaints	0	11	0%
CSP Timelines	11	11	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	0	87

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	6,198	108	641	29	1.7	4.5

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education